

REMARKS

The Applicant and the undersigned thank Examiner Assaf for his careful review of this application. Consideration of the present application is respectfully requested in light of the above amendments to the claims, and in view of the following remarks. Claims 1-3 and 9-11 have been rejected. Upon entry of this amendment, Claims 1-2, 5-7, 12-25, and 60 remain pending in this application. Claims 1, 12, and 60 are the independent claims in this application.

Attached hereto is a marked-up version of the changes made to the claims by the current amendment. The attached page is captioned "Version with markings to show changes made".

Restriction Requirement

The Applicants acknowledge that the Examiner has maintained the restriction requirement for the present application. The Applicants remind the Examiner that since the Applicants elected with traverse, they have preserved their right to file a divisional application, if desired by the Applicants.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 and 103 (a)

The Examiner rejected Claims 9-11 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,111,688 to Kobayashi et al. The Examiner rejected Claims 1-3 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,917,623 to Yoshida (cited by the Applicants). These rejections are traversed.

Since the Applicants desire to advance the prosecution of this application with minimal delay, the Applicants have incorporated the subject matter of allowable dependent Claim 8 into amended independent Claim 1. Further, the Applicants have cancelled dependent Claims 3 and 4 and combined it with the subject matter of the previous version of independent Claim 1 in order to make new and allowable independent Claim 60.

The Applicants' action in no way admits to the merits of the Examiner's arguments. In other words, the Applicants' action can not be interpreted to mean that they agree with any of the Examiner's assertions outlined in the Examiner's Office Action mailed on April 10, 2002.


Accordingly, this amendment has rendered the Examiner's rejection moot and the instant application should now be in condition for allowance. Such action is hereby courteously solicited.

Conclusion

The foregoing is submitted as a full and complete response to the Office Action mailed on April 10, 2002. The Applicant and the undersigned thank Examiner Assaf for consideration of these remarks. The Applicant has amended the claims and has submitted remarks to traverse rejections of Claims 1-3 and 9-11. The Applicant respectfully submits that the present application is in condition for allowance. Such action is hereby courteously solicited.

If the Examiner believes that there are any issues that can be resolved by a telephone conference, or that there are any formalities that can be corrected by an Examiner's amendment, please contact the undersigned in the Atlanta Metropolitan area (404) 572-2884.

Respectfully submitted,


Steven P. Wigmore
Reg. No. 40,447

King & Spalding
45th Floor
191 Peachtree Street, N.E.
Atlanta, Georgia 30303
404.572.4600
K&S Docket: 06948.105013

VERSION WITH MARKINGS TO SHOW CHANGES MADE

1. (Once Amended) An optical add-drop multiplexing (OADM) device comprising:
a wavelength adapter module for transforming unstabilized non-monochromatic or monochromatic light energy into one or more channels of stabilized monochromatic light energy having one or more predefined wavelength regions; and
a filter module for at least one of dropping, adding, and recombining one or more channels of stabilized monochromatic light energy having one or more predefined wavelength regions, whereby information traffic carried by an optical waveguide is substantially increased; and wherein the OADM device is part of a SONET optical network.